

Remarks

The applicants have carefully reviewed the Office action dated November 14, 2007. The rejections of the claims are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested. In view of the forgoing amendments and the following remarks, all claims are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added by the amendments because all amendments to the specification include subject-matter that was illustrated in the original drawings. Withdrawal of the rejections to the claims and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings

FIGS. 5-6 and 10-11 were objected to for failing to show blocks 515, 615, 1015, and 1115, which were described in the specification. FIG. 6 was also objected to for showing block 625, which was not described in the specification. In light of the forgoing amendments to the specification, any objections that may have been proper are respectfully traversed and withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC § 112

The Office action indicated that claims 1, 7, and 19 were rejected for allegedly describing subject matter which was not sufficiently described in the specification. However, the applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the original specification and the drawings discloses the claimed subject-matter. Further, the forgoing amendments to the specification clarify the description of such subject-matter. In particular, FIG. 5 illustrates that if a request to access a restricted protocol is discovered (block 510), the request should be rejected (block 525). In describing FIG. 5, paragraph [0038] of the original specification recited that if the association of a driver request with a violating condition is determined by determining that the driver request is a request to access a restricted protocol interface (block 510), the protocol interface is to be stored in a protocol database to protect the protocol interface (block 515). The specification referenced block 515, which was not present in the drawings. Rather, FIG. 5 shows that block 525 (labeled as “Reject request”) follows the determination of an access to a restricted protocol in block 510. Therefore, one of ordinary

skill in the art would have understood that the specification and drawings describe that, in response to determining that a driver request is a request to access a restricted protocol interface and determining that the request is associated with a violating condition, the protocol interface is to be stored in a protocol database to reject the request to protect the protocol interface. Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that the addition of “and in response to identifying the driver request as a request associated with a violating condition of the protocol interface” to claims 1, 7, and 19 does not constitute new subject-matter (i.e., subject-matter that was not disclosed in the originally filed application. Further, the clarifying amendments to paragraphs [0038], [0041], [0045], [0046] ensure that the specification fully supports the now pending claims. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

All of the pending claims were rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over “Extensible Firmware Interface Specification” (‘Version102’) in review of Blumenau et al. (US 6,993,581) (‘Blumenau’), and Munger et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0161884) (‘Munger’). It is respectfully submitted that the cited references fail to describe or suggest all of the recitations of the pending claims.

Claim 1 recites a method comprising, *inter alia*, rejecting a driver request, wherein rejecting the driver request comprises storing a protocol interface in a data structure in response to identifying a request by a driver to access an architectural protocol installed in a processor system and in response to identifying the driver request as a request associated with a violating condition of the protocol interface.

The Office action admits that neither of Version102 storing a protocol interface in a data structure in response to identifying a request by a driver to access an architectural protocol installed in a processor system and in response to identifying the driver request as a request associated with a violating condition of the protocol interface. (Page 5, § 11). Blumenau does not describe or suggest such an operation nor does the Office action contend that it does.

To cure the deficiencies of Version102 and Blumenau, the Office action sites Munger. The Office action cites several portions of Munger but provides no explanation as to how the cited portions describe the aforementioned recitation of claim 1. In particular, the Office action provides no explanation how changing an IP address of a router to obscure a resource teaches or suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art that a protocol interface should be stored in an accessible data structure. These operations are clearly not the same. Therefore, the applicants have been deprived of a full and fair opportunity to analyze and respond to the examiner's rejections and are left to guess as to how the examiner believes that Munger meets the recitations of claim 1. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that if the examiner wishes to maintain the rejection based on the combination of Version102, Blumenau, and Munger, a subsequent action providing an explanation (in accordance with the MPEP¹) of how Munger meets the recitations of the claims must be provided in a non-final office action.

Despite the deficiencies of the Office action, the applicants provide the following additional analysis of Munger to further the prosecution of the present application.

The applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Munger cannot cure the deficiencies of Version102 and Blumenau. In particular, the Office action cites several sections of Munger that describe changing the IP address of a router upon detection of an attack. None of the sections of Munger cited in the Office action describe or suggest storing a protocol interface in a data structure. Changing an address of a hardware component is not equivalent to storing a protocol interface in a data structure. Even if Munger stands for the proposition that a router should be protected by obscurity, none of cited references describes or suggests that storing a protocol interface in a data structure would provide such obscurity. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Munger does not describe or suggest storing a protocol interface in a data structure in response to identifying a request by a driver to access an architectural protocol installed in a processor system and in response to identifying the driver request as a request associated with a violating condition of the protocol interface. Therefore, no combination of Version102, Blumenau, and Munger can describe or suggest all

¹ MPEP § 706.02(j)

of the recitations of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom are patentable over the cited references.

Furthermore, the applicants note that while Version102 describes handling of a boot-mode protocol interface called by drivers and firmware, Munger is directed to a system for secure communication within a communication network. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine operations performed in user authentication for the routing of communication packets with the handling of the installation of a hardware access protocol due to the difference in the two environments and the authentication constraints associated with the hardware access protocol. In other words, one of ordinary skill would not be motivated to use operations described in Munger in conjunction with Version102. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Munger with Version102 despite Munger's alleged addressing of security concerns.

Claim 7 recites a machine readable medium storing instructions, which when executed, cause a machine to, *inter alia*, reject a driver request by storing a protocol interface in a data structure in response to identifying a request by a driver to access an architectural protocol installed in a processor system and in response to identifying the driver request as a request associated with a violating condition of the protocol interface. As described in conjunction with claim 1, no combination of Version102, Blumenau, and Munger describes or suggests storing a protocol interface in a data structure in response to identifying a request by a driver to access an architectural protocol installed in a processor system and in response to identifying the driver request as a request associated with a violating condition of the protocol interface. Therefore, claim 7 and all claims depending therefrom are patentable over the cited references.

Claim 19 recites a processor system to protect a protocol interface comprising, *inter alia*, a processor operatively coupled to the memory and to a machine readable medium storing instructions that, when executed, cause the processor to store a protocol interface in a data structure in response to identifying a request by a driver to access an architectural protocol installed in the processor system and in response to identifying the driver request as a request associated with a violating condition of the protocol interface. As described in conjunction with claim 1, no combination of Version102, Blumenau, and Munger describes or suggests storing a protocol interface in a data structure in response to identifying a request

by a driver to access an architectural protocol installed in a processor system and in response to identifying the driver request as a request associated with a violating condition of the protocol interface. Therefore, claim 19 and all claims depending therefrom are patentable over the cited references.

U.S. Serial No. 10/608,586
Response to the Office action dated November 14, 2007

If there is any matter that the examiner would like to discuss, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC
150 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dated: March 14, 2008

Michael W. Zimmerman/

Michael W. Zimmerman
Reg. No. 57,993
Agent for Applicants
312.580.1020